UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

The Church and the Community

By EDMUND H. REEMAN

Gandhi and Modern Civilization

By ALICE STONE BLACKWELL

The Disgrace of Our Political-Prisoner Status

By RICHARD W. HOGUE

VOLUME XC NUMBER 1

Chicago, September 14, 1922

PUBLISHED BI-WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, · Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., · } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss)_____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 3
The Church and the Community.—REV. EDMUND H. REEMAN 4
Across the Pacific. Editorial Correspondence.—REV. SYDNEY STRONG 8

ARTICLES—
The Joy of Life. VI.—EDWARD ARTHUR ROCKWOOD 9
Basic Truths. I. Seeds of Eternal Growth.—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 9
Gandhi and Modern Civilization.—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 10
The Disgrace of Our Political-Prisoner Status.—REV. RICHARD W. HOGUE 11
More Evidence on War Responsibility.—H. S. N. 12
Legalized Kidnapping.—SAMUEL DANZIGER 13
Uneasy Beats the Breast that Wears the Star.—H. S. N. 14
UNITY Fellowship Associates 15

A BOOK A WEEK—
Mary Badollet Powell Memorial—"A Young Girl's Diary."—JAMES WALDO FAWCETT 14

POETRY—
Voices.—HELEN FRAZEE-BOWER 3
Gratitude.—*O. Chester Brodhay* 8

THE FIELD—
Books Received 15
The Crisis in Chicago 15
Reunion in Australia 16
A New Way of Tempting Readers 16

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. XC THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1922 NUMBER 1

VOICES.

Again, oh good green woods, oh hills, oh sky,
I come to you. Devoid of thought I lie
And rest, content to see, and hear, and feel
The living, breathing pulse of the Ideal.
All green things smile me welcome: I am bound
By strange new kinship to the sky, the ground,
The stream, the hills, yea every little breeze
That stoops to kiss my all too eager mouth, and trees
That breathe a benediction over me.
All these are mine, my friends, my family.
Here can I rest at peace with God and man—
A finite part of the great Infinite Plan.

But even as I close my eyes, I hear
Strange murmurings from another world: The fear
Of poverty, the cold and awful dread
Of things that live for things that now are dead;
And pale, thin children's faces, pinched with pain;
And wantonness and hunger; and the vain,
Mad, selfish greed of men who toil and fret
To build up creeds and nations; the regret
In piteous eyes that wake to read, too late,
The stern decree of a relentless fate.
Distant, yet all too near, I hear the cry
Of souls in bitter anguish: men who die
To honor something—but they cannot tell
If it be God or Country, Heaven or Hell.
Beyond the shelter of my hills, I see
A desperate world reach out its hands to me,
Writhing in torture, moaning in distress,
Pleading for bruiséd, mangled lives—redress!

Oh woods, oh hills, oh sky, I fain would rest,
A willing captive in thy sheltered nest;
But stronger than the kinship of yon wood
I feel the call of the Eternal Good.
The gray hills bid me stay; each tiny leaf
Whispers a separate, individual grief—
I must not backward look, not mine to choose;
The suffering call—and I cannot refuse.

HELEN FRAZEE-BOWER.

A writer in *The Commonweal* (Melbourne), quotes some pertinent sentences from an address by the Rev. F. Priest, made at Perth on Anzac Sunday. He said:

Those whose lives were sacrificed would best be honored by "the high resolve that there shall be a new birth of freedom from all that which makes war possible for us and the world." Among the measures advocated by him towards this great end are: (1) Abolition of compulsory training for our boys, which was surreptitiously introduced without reference to the people; (2) Complete democratic control of all foreign diplomacy; (3) By bringing into all our business and commercial relations the word "Service." If there is to be war in the Pacific, it will not be because of race, or color, or religion; it will be commercial, between the financiers of the world. Not wages and dividends, but how the needs of men and women can be served, must be the ruling question and idea.

The same paper comments on the race problem in Africa. There, as in India, the problem is complicated by the economic question.

A comparative handful of white people are surrounded in South Africa by millions of Africans, who, of course, have been treated as an inferior race and exploited by the mine-owners. In the late trouble on the Rand natives are said to have been cruelly treated, though acknowledged by General Smuts to have acted with self-restraint. The burning question seems to be wages. While the white man gets the plums in connection with the mines, the native has to do the rough work for a pittance. Naturally bad feeling has arisen, and has led to bloodshed. The black man is absorbing western civilization, and is not longer content to be treated as a helot or a slave.

Symptomatic of the disintegration of denominational lines is the growing desire for neighborliness on the part of theological seminaries. We are interested to learn from the *Friends' Intelligencer* that a group of Friends hopes to establish a Friends' Hostel, a permanent Friends' Center, on the campus of the University of Chicago. Besides the original Baptist Divinity School, there are now in operation a Disciples Divinity House, a Norwegian Baptist House, the Congregationalists have chosen a site for a seminary, the Universalists are on the ground and for a number of years the Unitarians have held a summer session near the University. It is safe to prophesy that in the free air of a great university creedal differences will grow more and more indistinct and the theological graduate of the future will care little under what heading the church to which he is called is listed, so that it promise him scope for true service.

A sentence in a letter from our representative in Bulgaria, Dr. Matthéeff, indicates how almost impossible it is for the thoughtful citizen to form impartial opinion on European questions. He considers the German problem the main one because it presents the larger interests, but the most interesting one is the Near East. "There the problem concerns many nationalities, shaped in the most arbitrary manner, each developing its tragedy through the darkest ways. There you will meet with inordinate desire, exaggerated acquisition, misplaced ambition, deceit, populations subjected to tyrant oppressors—a *complete work* of the wisemen, conquerors, met in Paris." One is tempted to echo the words of a weary subscriber who writes, "I am tired of trying to understand things." But Dr. Matthéeff says that *because* of the complexities of its problems the Near East is *interesting*. The great struggles, selfish and unselfish, are bringing changes, which undoubtedly mean progress on the road to a better day and challenge the consideration of the forward-looking.

Anent the question of the exclusion of colored students from Freshman dormitories at Harvard University, referred to in a recent paragraph in UNITY, one of our readers, who thinks that this did injustice to Harvard, quotes a letter from President Lowell which represents the position of the administration. This shows that the exclusion is not a general one and that colored students are freely and equally permitted in every dormitory and dining room at Harvard except in certain quarters where white students are required to go and which are inadequate for them. President Lowell says:

> Our principle has been that we owe to the negro just as good an opportunity for education as we can give to anyone; but that we do not owe it to him to force him, and others, into social relations which are not mutually agreeable; and residence in the Freshman Dormitories, is for white students, compulsory so far as there is room in those dormitories. There is not at present room enough for all the white students who would otherwise go there. Of course this rule applies also to the dining-rooms in those dormitories. Where residence or the taking of meals is not compulsory, as is true of the other dormitories and Memorial Hall, etc., the negro students are admitted.

We are glad of this information as it puts a different light upon the situation.

The Church and the Community

Every church is in reality a community institution and the test of its value is the influence that it exerts in its own community. More and more we are learning to estimate the value of social agencies by the service they render. That things shall serve a useful purpose and justify by the purpose the cost of their maintenance is rapidly becoming one of the fundamental principles of our social life. In the ordinary business of commerce and industry the matter is largely taken care of by natural competition and no business can long survive that does not minister to some genuine human need or some real human demand. Some businesses, it is true, depend to a large extent upon what we call an artificially created demand, but even in these cases the demand must be created before the business can flourish. Furthermore, it is legitimate to say that any business or industry is economically unsound the conduct of which does not make possible an adequate living wage to the people employed in it and a reasonable return upon the capital invested in it. Whether the net returns to be derived from any enterprise be measured in dollars and cents or in any other value terms it is reasonable and proper to expect that returns shall be shown. Much the same is it with the institutions and agencies of our social life. Their stability and soundness depend upon the values involved and the returns made. How much schools, churches, libraries and such like institutions are really worth depends entirely upon the extent to which they count in the life of the community by which they are supported. If a school does not educate it is dear at any price, and so is a church that exists but exerts no influence.

Until quite lately it has been held to be sacrilegious to apply these ordinary standards of evaluation to churches and their work. The general idea apparently being that churches exist by some sort of divine and supernatural right that precludes any human judgment in regard to them. Even to-day we see lingering traces of this idea in the special privileges accorded to churches by many states in the form of tax-exempted property and in such personal favors to the clergy as special rates of fare on the railroads.

The plea is often made that people should support churches and attend them because churches are good things to have in a community. Why they are good things to have, however, and precisely what their real value is are points that it is often left to the sympathetic imagination to fill out. The plainest fact in the whole situation to-day is that we shall never get down to bedrock in these things until we have cleared away a good deal of verbiage by which the real issues are confused and are willing to allow that churches are just as much human institutions as any other institution of man and that therefore the only justification for the existence of a church is that it produces results in human well-being. One of the great reasons for the inefficiency of many present day churches is that they are living on their own past and stand in no vital relation to the present urgent needs of humanity. They exist as the echoes of earlier human beliefs and traditions and their chief strength is the lingering popular distaste of one generation to break away from the ideas of an earlier generation, which distaste many churches and churchmen seek to capitalize to the fullest possible extent.

If we had followed in other departments of life the custom that still prevails in many churches we should still be riding in buggies and ploughing with oxen in America and the tractor and the name of Henry Ford would be both unknown. If we had followed the same custom in education and in scientific research we should still be living in the dark ages, so far, at least, as the rank and file of people are concerned, and that vast body of learning we call modern knowledge, with all the advantages it has brought to mankind would be a thing unknown. Physicians would still be applying poultices to their patients and leeches to their veins, and cities would be seeking to combat epidemics, not by improved methods of sanitation, but by an increased fervor of supplication to a divine intervener. For the fact is that whereas the aggressive modern spirit is essentially forward-looking, the spirit of many churches, perhaps even a majority of churches, is backward-looking. If the appeal is not

to Peter, then it is to Luther, or Calvin, or Wesley, or some other worthy of an earlier time long ago dead, after whose ideas the principles of churches are fashioned, or in the steps of whose beliefs the sanctified of the churches are cajoled to walk.

Even more hindering, if that be possible, is the confusion that exists concerning the question—What is a Church? I do not now refer to the differences of administration that exist between the organizations of the various sects and parties of Christendom. I refer to the more fundamental difference of idea as to what a church actually is that is every day becoming more pronounced. For the moment we raise the question, What is a Church? we discover that at least two main ideas, each mutually exclusive of the other, are struggling for mastery in the modern mind. These two ideas, which we may call the sacerdotal view and the rational view may be stated as follows:

First: The idea that the church is a supernaturally created institution, ordained directly by God and founded by him upon Jesus Christ and his first apostles.

Second: The idea that the church is a purely human product and institution without any sanctions other than the ordinary sanctions of human association.

It is well known that until quite recent times the former view has held undisputed sway throughout the entire Christian world, dominating not alone the life and thought of churches in the character of their institutions and practices, but the nature of their relations also to the practical present needs of men and women. It is in the strength of this former view that churches have authoritatively claimed a right to interfere in the affairs of men and women to the extent, for example, of saying who shall and who shall not marry and under what conditions marriages shall take place. Sometimes even to the extent of saying who shall and who shall not sit upon the thrones of nations. In the strength of this sacerdotal idea churches have claimed both a supernatural origin and a supernatural authority—an authority that, even where it has not laid claim to complete temporal power, has left deep marks upon the world's life.

There is still a widespread belief among the ignorant and unlearned that alike in baptism and in burial there is some peculiar unction in the official ministrations of churches. To this day the people of any class who would consent to consign their deceased loved ones to the last silent resting places of earth without the official ministrations of some church are few in number; while numerous still are the parents who feel that their children are in mortal jeopardy both in this life and in another until they have been properly baptized with water by some officially ordained minister of the church.

In the name of the authority which the strength of this sacerdotal view has conferred churches also have laid their hands upon the minds of men and have sought to determine the bounds of their intellectual research and the fashion of their common thinking, substituting for the accrued results and the patient efforts of a tireless scientific method the arbitrary dogmas of the church's own accredited assumptions. In the name of this same authority churches have foisted the Bible upon men, not as a library of inspirational religious literature, but in all the binding literalness of the letter and as a precise code of life, doctrine, and morals, verbally compulsory as well as verbally inspired.

This idea of the church as a supernaturally created institution has a very long history. It reaches back beyond Christianity to the Judaism out of which Christianity grew and you find in the ancient Jewish church an almost exact parallel to the Christian church in all that relates to its origin and in all that makes for its authority. If anything the Jewish church was even more thorough-going in these matters than is the Christian church. Even the Jewish Temple was built according to what were believed to be, and indeed claimed to be, Divine plans, and it was God who gave instructions in detail alike for its building and for the conduct and order of its worship. Down to the setting apart of special families for the various temple offices and to the division of priests and Levites to their particular functions the whole thing stood by divine sanction and followed divine instructions.

You may remember how the story runs—How in the very early days of Hebrew tribal life Jehovah spoke to Moses out of a burning bush and later called him up into a mountain to receive the tables of stone on which were written the laws of God for the life of man. How the temple was first foreshadowed by the tabernacle with its elaborate ritual of service and its prescribed order of burnt-offerings and sacrifice—the tabernacle following even to its minutest details, to its curtains and loops and clasps, and to the texture and pattern of its drapery, the direct command and ordinance of Jehovah. And how, when the temple itself was at last completed, God appeared unto Solomon, its builder, as he had previously appeared to him at Gibeon, commending the work of the building and setting the sign and seal of his divine approval upon it.

As a matter of fact, there never was a God who spoke to Moses out of a burning bush and who with his own hands inscribed the tablets of the law upon Sinai—at least, I have never been able to find any convincing evidence for the story. All such stories belong to the mythology of an earlier world and there is nothing that would justify us in treating them in any other way than we treat the kindred legends of Pagan peoples.

Nevertheless, the Christian church has largely followed the model of the Jewish church and sacerdotalists have always claimed a similar and equally divine origin and authority for it. If not directly instituted by God, it is at least claimed that it was instituted by Jesus Christ who, the claim has been, was himself very God of very God.

Back of this general idea of the church lies, of course, the old idea of revealed religion, whereby it is held that religion is not a natural development and flowering of the human soul, but a supernatural and miraculous revelation from heaven. The things men need to know in religion, this theory claims, could never have been discovered. They must needs have been revealed by God himslf; God being, in this view, some sort of a super-ruler exercising supreme jurisdiction in human affairs and operating from a realm wholly beyond human sight or comprehension. In the simplest form of this belief God is supposed to reign in some heavenly court, somewhere up there beyond the clouds, and very much as an earthly ruler exercises authority upon earth. God, however, being the supreme king of kings whose sway holds all worlds in thrall, while earthly potentates are no more than the puppets of his power, to be sustained or subordinated at his will. As the language of the English Church service has it to this day (see Accession Prayer, English Prayer Book):

> Almighty God, who rulest over all the kingdoms of the world, and dost order them according to thy good pleasure, we yield Thee unfeigned thanks for that Thou was well pleased, as on this day, to set Thy servant our Sovereign Lord, King George, upon the throne of this Realm.

Over against all such ideas of religion and the church stands the growing view of modern times. First, that religion is a product of man's own aspiring spirit and out-reaching life—the flowering, as it were, of his aesthetic and ideal instincts, and therefore as much a human growth and development as forms of government or everyday social customs. And, secondly, that the church, like religion, is a purely human institution, fashioned by men and for men and subject to all the natural laws that govern human institutions.

As between these two quite irreconcilable views I do not personally see how the intelligent person of this twentieth century can long hesitate. On the one side are all the facts of the natural, historic growth and development of churches—their close identity with the march of human affairs and their equally close affinity with the prevailing modes of earlier human thought. On the other side there is nothing beyond the dogmatic assertions of partizan ecclesiastics themselves. Surely it was the sword of Constantine and his successors far more than the Cross or the words of Christ that gave the Catholic Church its dominion in the Roman Empire. As surely, also, it was the revolt of human souls against the oppression, intellectual and moral, of a developed ecclesiastical tyranny that gave Martin Luther and his fellow reformers of the 16th Century that popular support which made the Protestant Reformation a power in the life of Europe. It was not a new and special revelation from heaven that transferred authority in the Protestant bodies from a Roman heirarchy to Boards of Presbyters, or from Episcopal Anglicanism to Independent Congregationalism. It was the will of men working along the lines of their own developed convictions and moved by their own human desire to redeem their life from corruption.

In a word, it is the same power that has created governments and destroyed governments in order to build them anew that has created churches, and in turn sometimes destroyed churches in order to create them anew. And that power is simple, natural, unadulterated human power. The prophets of religion have commanded the attention of men and won their following, not because they spoke the word of some new revelation of heaven, but because they gave utterance to the deep and growing desires, impulses and passions of vast numbers of inarticulate people. The towering testimony of religion, if we read it aright, is not to the idea that there is a divinity beyond the skies, but to the inescapable fact that there is a divinity in human souls. So long as the world shall last it is ever more significant and glorious that men should create gods than that gods should create men.

That the people of this generation should come to a decision as between these two general views of what a church is is highly important because the whole question of the church in the community and of what it can count for really comes back in the last analysis to that decision. We must needs decide what a church is before we can ever decide what a church exists for. Said Dr. Henry W. Cope recently, "The trouble with the church to-day is that it does not know what it exists to do." Precisely. And why? Surely for no greater reason than because of all this confusion and uncertainty of thought as to what a church really is.

What the church exists for was plain enough so long as the old view of what the church *is* dominated. The church existed to reveal God to men; to secure their obedience to God's commandments; to save the souls of men and women and secure their escape from misery and their hope of blessedness in a life to come. Its priests were men specially set apart, commissioned with divine authority, performing divine functions, binding and loosing things on earth—that is they were bound or loosed on earth so they should be bound or loosed in heaven. They stood as intercessors between God and men, even pronouncing in the name of the divine authority with which they were invested the forgiveness of sins. The word of a priest made all the difference as between the supreme sanctity of a marriage vow and its utter emptiness and irretrievable immorality. The sign of a priest's finger crossed upon an infant's forehead meant all the difference between eternal life and eternal damnation, in the event of its decease. The approval of a church council upon a form of words or the shape of a doctrine meant all the difference between absolute truth and heretical falsehood.

In the same way, what a church exists for is plain enough to-day in the light of the newer rational view

of what a church is. The human church exists to serve human need. The very fact that it is a human institution, created by men and for men, relates it to every present normal need and interest of life and to the highest purposes as well as the deepest needs of the community in which it is set.

The function of the human church may be variously expressed from various angles. Some there are who will speak of its task as that of Christianizing the social order and establishing in this world the kingdom of heaven. To others its task may seem better expressed as that of showing men that Goodwill is the mightiest practical force in the world; that the Golden Rule works like gravitation; that all business worth doing is a branch of social service; that wrong is simply that which hurts or degrades men and that nothing can ever be right until it promotes the common welfare of mankind. Others may speak of its task in the terms of moral enlightenment, education, and vision. Others may say that a church exists to stimulate human life to higher endeavor and to intensify and sublimate human ethical values.

But howsoever it may be expressed the purpose for which the human church, as over against the sacerdotal church, exists is plain enough. It exists to exalt human life in all its present relations and activities. It exists to prepare men for life rather than death and to minister to their strength and sustenance in every worthy human endeavor. It exists to stimulate and not to stultify men in their search for larger truth and increasing good. It exists to organize the forces of human goodwill and human moral strength for whatever may be the immediate task that challenges human faith and courage. It exists to substitute truth for falsehood and knowledge for superstition and faith and hope for fear and doubt. Its field of labor is all that vast, and as yet almost unexplored, field of human spiritual values and moral and ethical endeavors.

In the human view of the church there is no peculiar priesthood and the power and authority of the church is simply the force and influence of its constituent members acting in concert. The ministry which this human view of the church sanctifies is a ministry not of authority but of service; a ministry that can only retain its influence by the service which it can render and the respect which it can maintain. The men and women who engage in this ministry are called thereto not by a commission from heaven, but by their own deep sense of humanity's need and their consciousness of a responsibility to render what service they can to their fellow-men. The hands by which they are ordained to their high office are not those of an unbroken succession of apostolic bishops or presbyters, but the hands that reach out from the dark places of life in piteous and often dumb appeal.

The only doubt about what a church exists for arises from confusion concerning what a church is and from the present widespread halting between two opinions as represented in the sacerdotal idea and the human idea of the origin and nature of the church.

The church as a supernatural institution has failed. The church as a human institution must take its place. We need no intermediary institution between earth and heaven. We do need an institution that will work to bring men into sympathetic, friendly relationship and that will witness to those deep truths of life upon which hang the hopes of humanity. We do need a more abundant life—a life freed from fetters and shackles and from servile slavery to external authority and abject superstition. There is no God whose words need to be translated to us by priest or church, or whose will must needs be revealed from the sky. There is no God whose favors we need beseech by prayers of supplication and petition, or whose mercy we need conjure by sacrifice or burnt-offering. The power that created us is here with us; lives in us; acts in us; is never absent from us. And here on the common human way is all the stuff to build a heaven.

> . . . we have enough!
> We need no other stones to build
> The stairs into the Unfulfilled—
> No other ivory for the doors—
> No other marble for the floors—
> No other cedar for the beam
> And dome of man's immortal dream.

Ours, here and now,

> . . . the stuff sublime
> To build Eternity in time!

This that we are living now IS LIFE. And this is the life that it is ours to make richer and nobler and grander. No heaven that has ever been dreamed can for a moment compare with the heaven that is possible on earth. Give me the blush of the rose in June; give me the love light in a woman's eyes; give me the winsome of a little child made free from care and pain; give me the glory of the mountain height and the crimson of the sunset sky; give me the music of the running brook and the thunder of the tide; give me the joy of a task well done—the flush of morning freshness and the evening weariness of honest toil—before all the fabled gold of heavenly streets and the songs and seraphs and the wings and palms of angels. Give me life, full and fragrant, for just one earthly day and I can smile in the teeth of eternity.

We shall learn how to make a church count in its community when we learn what a church is and what it actually exists for. In the human view of a church worship, preaching, teaching, fellowship, social activities are all parts of one and the same master purpose—the purpose of those who consciously unite in earnest and honest effort to learn the way of a better life.

A supernatural church may bless the armies of aggression as they go forth in the name of their petty patriotisms to do battle against the rights of men of other race and color, but a human church will bless only those efforts that make for mutual human welfare and that serve to unite in common purpose the scat-

tered races and nations and groups of mankind. A supernatural church may justify divine iniquity in the name of divine omnipotence, but a human church will have but one name and sign for righteousness and but one name and sign for sin, and that the measure of its bane or blessing for all the sons of men. A supernatural church may boast its miraculous origin, but a human church will glory only in its growth as the purposeful association of men and women. A supernatural church may estimate its influence in its community by the number who accept its dogmas, mumble its shibboleths, and subscribe with dull intelligence to the duller letter of its creeds—a human church can count in a community only for the moral power that it actually wields and for the influence for righteousness that its association actually creates. In short a human church can only count for what the people who make it WILL that it shall count. And therein lies the responsibility of accepting its purpose and uniting in its fellowship. EDMUND H. REEMAN.

Across the Pacific

Editorial Correspondence

The All-Australian Trades Union Congress—the second one—has just closed July 1 an all week session, in Melbourne. Among the important steps taken were plans to avert war and to bring about greater solidarity for effective action.

The Congress, by vote, adopted plans for the holding of a Pan-Pacific Congress in 1923 whose purpose shall be the prevention of war, by industrial action. Let me give the full text of the resolutions which may eventually have a wide-reaching effect, depending on the response from America, Japan, Canada, etc.

The movement for such a congress was broached a year ago and now gives promise of realization.

PREVENTION OF WAR

That whereas we believe another war to be in the nature of things capitalistic, and whereas we view with suspicion the Conferences at Washington and Genoa as responsible for merely a realignment of warlike alliances; and whereas, despite all the disarmament measures, increased preparations for war are being made in the world's laboratories and factories; and whereas we fear that another war to end a war will end civilization, culture, and progress; and whereas international working class action is essential for the preservation of permanent peace, this Congress declares its uncompromising hostility to all bonds of militarism and war, and urgently calls upon the workers to at once organize to prevent war by linking up with each other in order to oppose the designs, methods, and machinations of capitalistic government, and as a step in this direction, this Congress instructs the Council of Action to convene a pan-Pacific congress of working class organizations to meet next year in Australia simultaneously with the pan-Pacific Science Congress.

That it be a direction from the Congress to all trades unions to hold demonstrations against war in all States during the week of the anniversary of the war, and the Trades Hall Councils be asked to make arrangements for such demonstrations.

The above resolutions were carried with practical unanimity, although it is asserted that some of the "reds"—who, of course, are opposed to capitalistic wars, yet feel that war methods must be used against the capitalistic system—retired from the room while the vote was taken.

I keep asking myself why must Labor be the pioneer in such practical efforts to prevent war? Why not the Church? or the State?

The second important step taken by the Congress was toward One Big Union, for the purpose of presenting a solid front for the "socialization of industry," the avowed objective of Australian organized labor—both in the Trades Unions and in the Labor (political) Party.

I cannot do better than give the resolution providing for the Council of Action, which will be in the saddle during the whole period between Congresses—and which clearly means consolidation of organization and effort.

THE COUNCIL OF ACTION

That until the One Big Union includes all trades unions this Congress decides and agrees, in the names of the trades unions of Australia and New Zealand, that the All-Australia Trades Union Congress meet not less than every two years, place and date to be arranged, and upon the acceptance of the following provisions:—(a) That each State Trades Union be entitled to representation by contracting to observe the decisions of the Congress; (b) That the Congress have full power to decide its own procedure and rules; (c) That the governing body of the Congress be a Commonwealth Council of Action of 18, constituted of twelve elected by the Congress and one from the Trades Hall Councils of each State; (d) That the Council of Action shall carry out the instructions of the Congress, and in any dispute co-operate with the Trades Hall Councils of the State or States involved.

Since this letter seems to be running into resolutions, let me give a third resolution adopted by the Labor Congress, on the subject of

LABOR COLLEGES

That, recognizing the advisability of establishing the Labor College movement on a much bigger scale than at present, and the appointment of a director in chief to organize Labor College classes, this congress empowers the "Council of Action" to appoint a committee of five to do propaganda work to that end and to induce different working-class centres to establish circles and classes as preparatory steps to the bigger movement, and that the "council" have power to add to the committee or appoint other committees for the purpose.

In my next letter I hope to tell you about Mr. Sastri's, of India, visit to Australia.

SYDNEY STRONG.

GRATITUDE.

The wind was screaming round the eaves,
Pounding the window casements,
Scattering the rain like gusts of shrapnel,
Flattening the wet bullets
Against the resisting glass.

And yet there was a song within my heart
That would not recognize the storm,
That rose above discordant elements
To heights where darkness never dwells.

—O. Chester Brodhay.

The Joy of Life

VI.

The name, Kathleen Beverly Robinson (Mrs. Frank L. Ingels) is not particularly familiar even to art connoisseurs, yet in her marble sculpture, "Inspiration," this pupil of Lorado Taft has produced a piece of work worthy of thoughtful consideration.

The composition consists of two woman figures. One of these is seated. The other stands close to, but in back of the seated friend, and is leaning slightly forward apparently whispering in her ear. As characters, both give one a sense of angelic other-worldliness. The facial features are beautiful, but of an ascetic beauty. The straight lines which the sculptor has used in her treatment of the hair, the arrangement of the long flowing gowns, and the general posture of the arms and hands give to the figures, when combined with the resignation portrayed in their facial expressions, a medieval monastic aspect. This lends restfulness to the treatment, and causes, in the beholder, muscular relaxation and mental quietude. There is peace there, tranquillity. And yet, while this is true in regard to lines and, especially, the contour of the faces, there is revealed a subtle suggestiveness of action. The woman who is seated has an impulse to rise, while the one leaning over her implies in the support given by her outstretched arms and the grasp of her fingers a readiness to assist in the action the moment her friend responds to her entreaty. In this subtle potential movement lies the theme, "Inspiration"—the influence, encouragement; the fresh hope and strength administered by a loved one.

Has not Kathleen Beverly Robinson revealed to us through this piece of art, friendship's greatest mission—to give of ourselves in the hour when hope burns low in the soul of our friend, when oppressions weigh heavily, doubt out-balances assurance, and hesitancy impedes progress? We travel not alone through life, but in small groups, and often we must support another while a shoe lace is tied or a sprained ankle relieved. One cannot come into intimate relationship with many for strength and time will not permit, but with a chosen few he has this privilege; and if each individual would accept of this privilege, would faithfully and devotedly give of himself to his chosen few, none would have to journey through life deprived of the inspiration which is to be had through the affectionate touch, and the confidential word. Then too, friendship is reciprocal. One is not constantly the donor and another the receiver, but each are able to play both roles. If to-day I give of my hope and courage, my exuberance of life to my friend, it is in humility of spirit that I do so, well conscious that the next episode may find me prostrate in grief and despair, and eagerly receiving from whispered word and kindly touch the solace which only my friend can give. The seated figure in "Inspiration" is the recipient, but not for long. With revived courage will come her hour of ministry.

"Inspiration," like so much of the work of its creator's tutor, is the artistic expression of a great experience of life, and because this is so it will always remain a credit to American sculpture, and an ennobling influence in American life.

EDWARD ARTHUR ROCKWOOD.

Basic Truths

I.

SEEDS OF ETERNAL GROWTH.

Who can say of a single seed what harvests it contains
Or to what body or soul it may yet furnish strength?
So these thoughts of my heart—
I can not rest till I have planted them in other hearts.

* * * *

Basic truths are the simplest truths.

* * * *

There is no need to compromise or invent makeshifts in our dealings with one another if we are actuated by nothing but the love of beauty and truth.

* * * *

Recognition of and obedience to universal truths will bring beauty into all lives

* * * *

That which will most simply and directly bring beauty into all lives is by that very result proven to be universal truth.

* * * *

That only is beauty by means of the love of which the soul becomes beautiful.

The most beautiful truths are the most practical.

* * * *

All that the finest and highest intelligence can possibly teach us is already waiting to ripen into consciousness within our own souls.

* * * *

The truth the consciousness of which we arrive at spiritually will impart new life and light to whatever else we have learned or can learn by any other process or from any other source.

* * * *

We are wisest when we are simplest and most trustful. Nothing can deceive or mislead the truly simple soul.

* * * *

It is comparatively unimportant what we believe; the main thing is why we believe. What we say counts for little unless it be said in the right tone and with the true emphasis. VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

Gandhi and Modern Civilization

Rev. Charles W. Wendte, in his article on Gandhi, has been very naturally misled by a piece of anti-Gandhi propaganda. He quotes, as Gandhi's latest exposition of his opinions, an Associated Press dispatch purporting to be a letter from the Indian saint. The dispatch was sent out as news, and was undoubtedly meant to deceive its readers into believing it referred to a recent letter. It is in fact a garbled extract from a letter written by Gandhi many years ago, which may be read in "Mahatma Gandhi: His Life, Writings and Speeches," pages 84 and 85.

Gandhi undoubtedly goes to an extreme in his advocacy of the simple life; and Mr. Wendte intimates that this shows he is not fit to be the leader of his people in their struggle for freedom. He might as well argue that George Washington was not the right leader for the American Revolution, because he held many erroneous beliefs in regard to theology, medicine, politics and economics. In many points, his ideas were not even abreast with the best thought of his own time. But he was right on the main question then at issue. He was the chosen leader of his people, and he was the man who had the character and the capacity to lead them to victory. We venerate him in spite of his intellectual errors.

The same is true of Gandhi. He is the chosen leader of his people; his character commands the admiration even of his enemies; and he has evolved the only plan that seems likely to secure self-government for India within any measurable time. The fact that it is a peaceful method gives it not only an added claim upon our sympathy, but an immense significance for the world. If it succeeds, it will be the greatest object lesson ever given on the power of soul force to overcome tyranny without the use of physical violence.

Jesus was not unfitted to be a spiritual leader because he advocated some impracticable ideas, such as "Give to every man that asketh of thee"; "If any man hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple"; the prohibition of divorce, etc. Then there are his non-resistance doctrines, which I heard warmly attacked by Mr. Wendte in a discussion at the Twentieth Century Club of Boston, after an address by the Rev. John Haynes Holmes in favor of non-resistance.

The main part of Jesus's teaching is profoundly wise; and the same is true of Gandhi's, which indeed is largely identical with it. Moreover, Gandhi has quickened the spiritual life of millions in a way unequalled by any man of modern times.

In my opinion, the unwise part of Gandhi's creed—the extreme to which he carries his disapproval of most things characteristic of Western civilization—is the back-swing of the pendulum, the revolt of a pure and righteous soul against the abominations so conspicuous in Europe and America. Gandhi is absolutely sound in saying that the aim of a true civilization must be the goodness and happiness of the people. Tried by that test, what kind of spectacle does the so-called civilized world present to-day?

Mr. Wendte says Gandhi wants India to become "a nation of peasants only toiling wearily at the hand-loom." Gandhi points out that the worker with plough or hand-loom can control his own hours of labor. A recent item in a New York paper mentions that the first strike of Indian women, accompanied by picketing, has lately taken place at the New China textile mills in Bombay. The women struck because they were required to work a twelve-hour day and a seven-day week. The weariness caused by a hand-loom would be nothing to this. The incident throws a bright light on one reason why Gandhi objects to the growth of the factory system in India. These women's wages were $6 per month.

Gandhi says that the main object of Western civilization is to increase bodily comfort, and that it does not even secure that. He might have gone further. The main aim of the forces that largely control the so-called civilized world to-day is to promote the continued heaping up of huge fortunes by a few, under conditions that involve bodily discomfort and stunted minds for the many. No wonder Gandhi wants no civilization of that type for India!

But he is far from advocating "a worship of the unintelligent and slavish past." He condemns unsparingly infant marriages, the ill usage of widows, and other ancient customs; and he pleads earnestly for brotherly treatment of the low-caste Hindus, the so-called "untouchables." His preaching and practice on that point have done more than anything else to break down the age-old barriers of caste. Nor does he "refuse international exchanges of sentiment and service." He recommends the translation of good English books into the Indian tongues; and he says that Englishmen who wish to live in India not as masters but as brothers will be welcome. He says, "We can learn several things from them, and they can learn many things from us."

Gandhi has made plenty of mistakes, including the grevious mistake of joining with the Mohammedans of India to demand the restoration of the temporal sovereignty of the Sultan of Turkey over all the sacred places of Islam. But he is the greatest spiritual force in the world to-day, and one of its greatest statesmen.

Mr. Wendte says if Gandhi had his way India would be a nation of peasants "scratching the earth with a stick," and that the country would soon fall under the control of native or foreign oppressors. If Gandhi had his way, India would have 315,000,000 men and women all living the simple life, all full of pure and fervent love for God and man, all absolutely free from fear, anger, selfishness and greed, all able to exercise "soul force" in its highest power. Such a nation would be invincible; and what form of plough they used would matter very little. With the spirit of humility and teachableness inculcated by Gandhi, they would undoubtedly slough off in time the preference for antiquated machinery, and the other extravagances of asceticism. No nation is likely to err for an unlimited time on the side of simplicity and self-abnegation.

These extreme ideas, it may be said in passing, are not Gandhi's alone. Ruskin, William Morris, Tolstoy and others have advocated doctrines very similar.

In conclusion, I will quote from a more recent expression of opinion by Gandhi, his address at the opening of the Tibbi (Medical) College at Delhi. He said, in part:

In order to avoid any misinterpretation of my views on medi-

cine, I would crave your indulgence for a very brief exposition of them. I have said in a booklet much criticized at the present moment that the present practice of medicine is the concentrated essence of Black Magic. I believe that a multiplicity of hospitals is no test of civilization. It is rather a symptom of decay, even as a multiplicity of *Pinjarapoles*[1] is a symptom of indifference to the welfare of their cattle on the part of the people. I hope, therefore, that this college will be concerned chiefly with the prevention of diseases rather than their cure. The science of sanitation is infinitely more ennobling, though more difficult of execution, than the science of healing. I regard the present system as Black Magic, because it tempts people to put an undue importance on the body, and practically ignores the spirit within. I would urge the students and professors of the college to investigate the laws governing the health of the spirit, and they will find that they will yield startling results even with reference to the cure of the body.

The present science of medicine is divorced from religion. A man who attends to this daily *Namaz* or his *Gayatri*[2] in the proper spirit need never get ill. A clean spirit must build a clean body. I am convinced that the main rules of religious conduct conserve both the spirit and the body. Let me hope and pray that this college will witness a definite attempt on the part of the physicians to bring about a reunion between the body and the soul.

Modern medical science, having ignored the condition of the permanent element in the human system in diagnosing diseases, has ignored the limitations that should naturally exist regarding the field of its activity. In trying to cure a body of its disease, it has totally disregarded the claims of the subhuman creation. Man, instead of being the lord and therefore the protector of the lower animal kingdom, has become its tyrant, and the science of medicine has been probably his chief instrument for tyranny. Vivisection, in my opinion, is the blackest of all the black crimes that man is at present committing against God and his fair creation. We should be able to refuse to live if the price of living be the torture of sentient beings. It ill becomes us to invoke in our daily prayers the blessing of God, the compassionate, if we in turn will not practice elementary compassion towards our fellow creatures.

Having said this much, I would like to pay my humble tribute to the spirit of research that fires the modern scientist. My quarrel is not against that spirit. My complaint is against the direction the spirit has taken. It has chiefly concerned itself with the exploration of the laws and methods conducing to the merely material advancement of its clientèle. But I have nothing but praise for the zeal, the industry and the sacrifice that have animated the modern scientists in their pursuit of truth.

Lastly, I hope this college will set its face absolutely against all quackery, western or eastern, refuse to recognize any but sterling worth, and that it will inculcate among the students the belief that the profession of medicine is not intended for earning fat fees, but for alleviating pain and suffering. With the prayer that God may bless the labors of its founder and organizers, I formally declare the Tibbi College open.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

The Disgrace of Our Political-Prisoner Status

During my recent stay in England I was repeatedly asked whether statements in the English press to the effect that political prisoners—war-time prisoners—are still confined in the United States, could be true. It seemed almost incredible to English people that these men could still be in prison for *expression of opinion only,* and under war-time legislation now no longer in force.

Again and again I was humiliated to be obliged to admit that my own country is indeed the only one of all that were engaged in the world war, that is now in this indefensible position. I use the word "indefensible" advisedly. The Government has given no valid or defensible reasons whatever for its action. In writing these words I have in mind the letter sent by Attorney General Daugherty not many months ago in reply to inquiries made on this subject by the Federal Council of Churches. The Council published Mr. Daugherty's letter with its own findings of *fact* regarding the various statements the letter made (March 11, 1922, Issue of Information Service, Federal Council of Churches, 105 East 22nd St., New York, N. Y.).

I have in mind also the practically invariable remark made by all Government officials when writing or speaking of the release of these men—that "No one advocating the overthrow of the Government by violence will be pardoned." It seems to me about as relevant to continue to repeat this ancient formula in connection with these particular men, as it would be to reiterate that "No one addicted to walking on his head will be allowed at large." Many of these men I know personally. I know also that the industrial organization to which practically all of them belong, is concerned exclusively with industry and is not even interested in the overthrow of any government whatsoever.

It would be amusing, were it not for the tragedy that it connotes, to hear men who hold positions of high responsibility talk in this way as if they were entirely ignorant of a fact well known to people at large (apparently well known to thinking, intelligent people even on the other side of the world)—that every one of these political prisoners has been legally and completely cleared of *all* the preposterous charges against them born of war-time hysteria; that they are now in prison solely for *opinions;* and that none of these opinions have anything to do with violence in any degree or direction or with the overthrow of any government. This is a matter of legal record—data available to anyone who cares to take the trouble to read it. Some one should inform all Government officials of these facts, so that they will not continue to make so serious a blunder in public any longer. I would not of course like to believe that they know the facts and yet continue to harp on this irrelevant formula disingenuously. I would much rather give them all the benefit of the doubt. No honest government has any need to be intolerant. And there is no "agitator" like injustice.

Has not the time come for all of us, regardless of church or political affiliations, regardless of the demands of our own personal affairs, regardless of every consideration except that of the plain justice of this matter,—the inalienable human rights involved, the sheer humanity at stake—to take our stand definitely, emphatically, unequivocally, in behalf of these men in Leavenworth who are standing so courageously by their principles and their consciences, in the face of such odds? These men are bearing the brunt of the impetus towards intolerance and repression, begotten by the war, and are upholding the best traditions of American manhood, laying a foundation for a more truly American conception of freedom, a freedom that is worthy the name.

Surely too few of us in the churches are bearing our share of this burden, this work of foundation-building. These men are living true to their ideals at the cost, literally, of their lives. How many of us are doing anything like this for the ideals we profess

[1] *Pinjarapoles.* Free animal hospitals.
[2] *Namaz* or *Gayatri.* They are the sacred words used in prayer. Mohammedans call it *Namez.* The Hindus call it *Gayatri.*

to hold supreme? How many of us can measure up in courage, in sheer honesty of purpose, in *faith,* with these men who are giving their lives in the full knowledge that for them individually there is everything to lose and nothing to gain; that no advantage can possibly accrue to them personally? They are true to their ideals in the hope that "the children of the future" may find a better world to live in.

If any one who reads this does not yet know all the facts—the whole truth—about these men, I shall be glad, if letters are addressed to me in care of this paper, to send the information that I have.

I feel, indeed, that the political prisoner situation as a whole is one of the gravest issues that confront us today, and that we should all—especially we in the churches—make it our definite and serious concern to inform ourselves fully of it, in all its bearings. RICHARD W. HOGUE.

More Evidence on War Responsibility

The editor of *Foreign Affairs* (London) in publishing an article entitled "An Historic Trial and Its Results" writes the following pithy introduction:

> "Apart from allegations of a *general* character, as to *pre*-war policy, armament, etc., allegations of a precise and specific character relied upon by the authors of the Versailles Treaty to build up the legend of Germany's unilateral responsibility for the war have been extraordinarily few. They rest, as a perusal of the Allied indictment drawn up at Versailles will show, upon three documents. These documents were (1) a despatch from the French Ambassador at Berlin, dated November 22, 1913, purporting to be the record of a conversation between the Kaiser, the King of the Belgians, and General von Moltke, and published in the French Yellow Book; (2) The record of an alleged secret War Council held at Potsdam on July 5, 1914; (3) The text of a report dated July 18, 1914, attributed to the Bavarian Minister at Berlin, Count Lerchenfeld (but whose author was Baron Schoen, Secretary of the Bavarian Legation), to the Bavarian Government. Of these three documents, the interpretation given to the first was catagorically denied by Von Moltke, and it does not appear to have been revived; the second has been decisively disproved and is now no longer advanced. The third is now disposed of under the circumstances narrated below."

We make no apology for giving our readers the whole of the article, as it appeared in *Foreign Affairs,* July, 1922. The matter has been dealt with by only one paper in America, to our knowledge, *The Freeman.*

"At the end of November, 1918, the Kurt Eisner revolutionary Government at Munich published the text of a Report from the Bavarian Legation at Berlin, written by the Legation's Secretary, Baron Schoen, to the Bavarian Government on July 18, 1914, dealing with the Imperial German Government's attitude towards Austria in the latter's quarrel with Serbia. As published, this Report showed the Imperial German Government cynically contemplating the explosion of a world-war as the result of Austria's proposed coercive measures against Serbia. Only after Germany had signed the Versailles Treaty did it become known that the text of Schoen's report had been published by Kurt Eisner in a mutilated form, *i.e.,* with important omissions. The full text revealed the Imperial German Government as contemplating and approving, not a world-war, but a localized war between Austria and Serbia.

The incident has recently given rise to a libel action to which great historical importance attaches. In view of the efforts made by the Jingo Press of France and England to attentuate its significance, I hope that *Foreign Affairs* will allow the facts to be set out. In its issue of July, 1921, the Bavarian nationalist monthly, the *Suddeutsche Monatschrift,* published a severe criticism of Eisner's action, and its editor, Professor Cossmann, added a footnote thereto to the effect that Mrs. Eisner, Kurt Eisner's widow, denied that the falsification had been perpetrated by her late husband, but by his private secretary, a certain Herr Fechenbach. Thereupon Fechenbach brought a libel action against Cossmann. It was tried at Munich and lasted from April 27 to May 4. The questions submitted to the court ran as follows:

> (1) Does the publication of the documents of July, 1914, constitute a falsification? (2) Had the falsification a fatal effect upon the Peace Treaty? (3) Was the falsification committed by the complainant?

VIEWS OF FOREIGN EXPERTS

Expert reports were read from twelve foreign authorities, amongst them the well-known American historian, Professor Sidney B. Fay; Captain E. N. Bennett and Mr. Joseph King, of the British I. L. P.; two members of the Neutral Commission into the war's origins; the Attorney-General of the Argentine Republic; a former Serbian diplomatist, and other American, Italian, Spanish, and Swedish experts in law or history. *All of them came to the conclusion that there had been falsification* (some of them making reservations as to the exact meaning of the German equivalent for falsification). *The most crushing judgment of all was that of the French Professor, M. Edouard Dujardin, of the Paris Sorbonne,* whose letter, after a detailed examination of the documents, concluded thus:

> I am of the opinion that the text such as published by the *Bayerische Staetszeitung*[1] is one of the most manifest and most criminal falsifications known to history.

Out of eight German experts who gave evidence *viva voce* and under oath, seven were of the same opinion. Only Professor Quidde, though strongly condemning the frivolous manner in which the abbreviated text had been originally published, contended that no intention to falsify could be proved. No doubt existed among the German experts as to the fact that the original publication had done much harm to the German cause. They argued that it had probably contributed to increase the cruelty of the Peace Treaty, and that it had been, and still was, an obstacle to destroying the myth of Germany's sole responsibility for the war. As to whether the falsification was perpetrated by Herr Fechenbach or not, no evidence could be produced, Fechenbach declaring that he had simply acted as Kurt Eisner's tool when typewriting the abbreviated text.

[1] *i.e.,* the abbreviated text as originally published by the Eisner Government.

THE QUESTION OF "WAR GUILT."

Technically speaking, the libel action was not concerned with the question of war guilt. But the declarations of the complainant gave the impression that he desired to prove that Germany had been planning a world war for years, and that being so, it did not matter whether the documents concerned had been mutilated or not. The question was thus re-opened. The complainant's statements were rebutted by the German experts, Dr. J. Lepsius and Dr. Fr. Thimme, who, together with Professor Mendelssohn Bartholdy, are the editors of the monumental publication of the German Foreign Office Archives from 1871 to 1914. They declared in their evidence that among the many thousands of volumes they had been perusing for almost three years, there was not a single document showing a desire on the part of the German Government to bring about war. Count Max Montgelas and others deposed that had the rulers of Germany desired war, they had magnificent opportunities for making it in 1898, during the Fashoda crisis, when a German attack upon France and Russia would have been welcomed in England; in 1905, when Russia was paralyzed with her Manchurian defeats and her revolution; during the first Balkan crisis in 1908-09, when the Russian armies were not re-organized; and even in 1911 at the time of the Agadir crisis, when the Russian armaments had not been completed. Much fresh evidence was also read in court, particularly concerning the endeavors of the German Government to reconcile Austria and Russia during the second Balkan crisis in 1912-13, the interviews of the Kaiser with Archduke Francis Ferdinand in 1914, and so on. As to the crisis of July, 1914, nothing was urged in court to excuse the *carte blanche* given to Austria to humiliate Serbia, but the unavailing efforts to put a bit in the mouth of Austria—after Serbia's conciliatory note had at last become known in Berlin—were referred to in much the same language as that used by Mr. Massingham in the last issue of *Foreign Affairs*. The effect of this evidence was such that on the fourth day of the trial, Herr Fechenbach, the complainant, summoned to declare whether or not he still believed in Germany's sole responsibility, made the following statement:

I am convinced that Eisner, if he had seen the German documents, the publication of which he had long been asking for, would most probably have changed his mind concerning Germany's sole responsibility for the war. I for my part declare that I no longer share my former views. My statements made the first day have been misunderstood. I simply explained what Eisner then knew and what led him to believe in Germany's sole responsibility. But at the same time I also protest against the falsehood of Germany's innocence.

Fechenbach's counsel urged that the question of responsibility must be reconsidered, and declared himself ready to collaborate in bringing forth any material apt to throw new light on the matter.

A minor incident occurred the second day of the trial, when the complainant produced a letter written on December 9, 1914, by the Bavarian Minister in Berlin, Count Lerchenfeld, to the Bavarian Prime Minister, Count Hertling, asking him to deny the statement of the French Yellow Book that he (Hertling) knew the text of the Austrian Note to Serbia before it was despatched. The very next day Lerchenfeld produced Hertling's answer to the effect that the statement was erroneous, as he had neither seen, nor been informed, of the exact text of the Austrian note before it was despatched. The truth is, of course, that the general tendency of the Austrian note was known not only in Berlin and in Munich, but in London, Paris, and Petrograd, but that the exact text was known only in Vienna." H. S. N.

Legalized Kidnapping

When the press reports a kidnapping it usually excites more horror and resentment than any crime short of atrocious murder. One pictures the suspense of the parents, their nerve-racking anxiety for days and weeks, the awful fright and suffering of the helpless little victim and the cold-blooded, devilish cruelty of the kidnappers. Much is said, at such a time, about what should be done to the criminals when caught. No punishment seems severe enough. Be the law ever so harsh it is denounced as too mild. Something must be done at once to stamp out this crime at any cost. So argues the hysterical press and public.

But what stirs press and public at such a time is not the essence of the crime but the fact that it has not been authorized by an act of Congress. Given that, the victims might get some sympathy and a few offers of help but little else. As an example the following story will suffice from the Baltimore *Evening Sun*:

Six more months of happy, but nevertheless anxious, waiting faces the family of fourteen-year-old Mollie Tsatskis, 2456 Druid Hill avenue, the girl who was once ordered deported to Poland, and who has since been given reprieve after reprieve through the influence of Senator Joseph I. France.

If Mollie's mental condition improves sufficiently to overcome the legal obstacles and requirements of the Immigration Bureau during the next six months she may be allowed to remain longer—probably forever, but if no improvement is shown, that same old anxious battle, which her friends have waged so earnestly for her, will have to be fought all over again.

The case of Mollie Tsatskis has grown into one of the most important immigration cases that has ever developed, not because Mollie is the daughter of a wealthy immigrant or the daughter of a celebrity—she is neither—but because her poor parents brought her over here, away from squalid Poland, hoping to make a new home. When they faced the immigration officials of New York, it was found that her mentality was lower than the required standard, and it was decreed that she should go back.

When it became known that the immigration officials contemplated separating the girl from the mother various aid societies became interested. Their agents saw that it would mean mental distraction to the mother; that it would mean the sending of a girl, mentally incapable of taking care of herself, to a cold, starving country where she had no friends.

These agents enlisted the aid of Senator France, and he has been interested in the case since that time.

Suppose that instead of a threatened lawful deportation this family were faced by a lawless blackhand threat to kidnap the child, unless certain demands were complied with, would its plight be any worse? How much comfort is there in assuring oneself that the law is more sacred than human rights, and its strict enforcement more desirable than considerations of humanity? SAMUEL DANZIGER.

A Book a Week

Mary Badollet Powell Memorial

A Young Girl's Diary. Anonymous. With a preface by Sigmund Freud. New York: Thomas Seltzer, $5.

I don't know (or care) how the Freudians explain this remarkable book; I suppose they find that it fits into their theory somehow.

What interests me about the volume is not so much the mind of the little girl whose journal it is supposed to be; it is rather the attitude of her parents, brother and sister, her other relatives, teachers and friends toward her.

I don't care very much what Rita thought of her mother; but I am intensely concerned to know what her mother thought of her daughters as they struggled through adolescence. Rita's reactions to people and things are not in any way exceptional; she seems to have been a very ordinary child—clever, inquisitive, agile, eager as most healthy children are. She was not "a wonder child." She is interesting only as an example of the average girl in conflict with the usual problems of the years between eleven and fifteen.

It seems to me that it is the parents' duty to see that their children learn about the scores of things that we bracket as "sex" from reliable teachers only. Any parent who allows a child to pick up his knowledge (?) of these matters in the streets fails in that respect to do his duty as a parent.

It is not so long ago that I was a boy, and I have not forgotten how puzzled and hurt I was at things I heard from other boys. For five or six years I carried about in my mind a wholly false and extremely unpleasant idea, so acquired, regarding certain fundamental facts of physiology. Indeed, I think all young people—certainly all boys—have similar experiences; they hear this or that from other children or read this or that in sensational newspapers and because they have never been taught any better they get mistaken ideas that are, to say the least, ugly and frightful.

When I was a reporter I was once sent to "write up" the suicide of a beautiful young woman who had killed herself because she was "afraid to marry." She had been deceived and tortured into hysteria by some mis-information similar in character doubtless to that which came to the author of this plaintive diary.

Tragedies are brewing everywhere every day in which there are reflected the cowardice and the false-modesty of mistaken parents and teachers. The years this child writes about were far from happy; they were blighted by a burden of error which should never have been allowed to accumulate—Rita should not have been deserted by her parents at the critical period in her young life.

The least a child can expect is the truth—so clean, so simple, so direct. And it is only fair that the parents should be the instructors—they are supposed to understand their own progeny.

Poor little Rita! They were very unkind to her, they failed her miserably. And how they would have stormed and railed if she had "disgraced" them!

Rita is the youngest child in a middle-class Austrian family, living in Vienna. The father is a busy lawyer, "burning the candle at both ends" for his family's sake. The mother is an invalid. She loves her children, but she does not understand them. When Rita would have asked her questions, she repulsed her with kind platitudes. The poor child finally came to the point where she could not understand how any one could have a parent for a confidant! The elder girl, Dora, is more successful in winning her mother's attention, but even she labors with a vast quantity of untruth and half-truth. The brother, Oswald, is a student at a mining school; always in "scrapes" and proudly disdainful of his sisters. Left to find the path for herself, Rita discovers in a school-mate, Hella, a comrade-soul, faced with the same problems, begging answers to the same questions; together they go down the three and a half years recorded in the published part of the journal. They make grotesque errors; they believe much that is not true and reject much that is; they are sensitive, easily hurt; they weep many bitter tears. Separated, they long for each other; together, they are but the two halves of the one existence. But a final separation awaits them when Rita is fourteen. First the invalid mother dies, and then the father; Rita and Dora are parted, and of course Rita and Hella, also. The last page is a pitiful curtain on a sorry tragedy in which all the elements and nearly all of the characters are commonplace.

Once when I was a child I remarked to my grandfather that "it is a dreadful world." He replied to the effect that the world is all right; it is the people in the world that are at fault. For months after our conversation I pondered over his statement. I asked myself this question: Must men and women fail because of conditions of existence against which it is useless to struggle, or do they fail because they lack the intelligence, the experience, the training to overcome conditions as they find them? I finally decided that many people were afraid of life, afraid to make their best effort; like a child in the dark they fear what they do not understand. Why were they afraid? Because, I answered, fear is a habit. It must then be the duty of men and women to do away with fear. How to go about it, then? By employing knowledge as one employs a lighted lamp in a dark chamber. Oh, I struggled with these thoughts for many months!

I can understand Rita; she was afraid—afraid of life. Her parents and her teachers could have helped her, could have taught her to be brave; but they, too, were afraid. That's the problem. The circle of fear—the fear of knowledge. If only we could bring ourselves to fear ignorance half as much!

If you are a parent or a teacher, gentle reader, I think Rita's diary may be of use to you. You should give it a trial, anyway. James Waldo Fawcett.

Uneasy Beats the Breast that Wears the Star

The following amusing anecdote I take from "A Wayfarer" in *The Nation and The Athenæum* (London).

Apropos of the "Honors." A friend of mine chanced to meet a worthy acquaintance, recently endowed with a K.B.E. [Knight of the British Empire]. Tendering the usual congratulations, he observed a certain reticence, amounting almost to trepidation, in the reception of them. Finally the newly titled one bent towards him, and in a heartfelt *tremolo* whispered, "I assure you I have done absolutely nothing wrong."

H. S. N.

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE BEACON PRESS, 25 Beacon St., Bosson, Mass.
For the Benefit of My Creditors, by Hinckley G. Mitchell.
CROWELL, THOS. G., Co., 426 W. Broadway, New York City.
A Man of Purpose, by Donald Richberg.
DORAN, GEORGE H., Co., 244 Madison Avenue, New York City.
The Kingfisher, by Phyllis Bottome.
What's Best Worth Saying, by Rev. Richard Roberts.
The Untried Door—An Attempt to Discover the Mind of Jesus for Today, by Rev. Richard Roberts.
The Training School of Popularity, by Muriel White Dennis.
Facing Reality, by Esme Wingfield-Stratford.
The Finality of Christ, by Rev. W. E. Orchard.
The Safest Mind Cure, by Rev. W. E. Orchard.
Christian Justice, by Norman L. Robinson.
The Quest of Industrial Peace, by W. M. Clow, D. D.
A Literary Guide to the Bible, by Laura H. Wild, B. D.
Seven Pamphlets—Christianity and Industry:
Industrial Facts, by Kirby Page.
Collective Bargaining, by Kirby Page.
Fellowship, by Basil Matthew and Harry Bisseker.
The Sword or the Cross, by Kirby Page.
The United States Steel Corporation, by Kirby Page.
America: Its Problems and Perils, by Sherwood Eddy.
Incentives on Modern Life, by Kirby Page.
MACMILLAN Co., 64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
Child Versus Parent, the Irrepressible Conflict, by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise.
The Reconstruction of Religion, by Charles A. Ellwood.
Landmarks on the History of Early Christianity, by Kircopp Lake, D. D.
Contemporary American Novelists, by Carl Van Doren.
English and American Philosophy Since 1800—A Critical Survey, by Arthur Kenyon Rogers.
Parenthood and Child Nurture, by Edna Dean Baker.
The Catholic Spirit in Modern English Literature, by George N. Shuster.
Causes and Cures for the Social Unrest, by Ross L. Finney.
THE ASSOCIATED PUBLISHERS, 1216 You St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
The Negro in Our History, by Carter Godwin Woodson.

THE CRISIS IN CHICAGO.

The Christian voters of Chicago are aroused over the candidacy of Anton Cermak for President of the Cook County Board of Commissioners, the chief engine for law enforcement in the county. As Cermak is secretary of United Societies which claim over 100,000 members in the county his candidacy is a challenge to the Churches which are making a desperate effort to rally their entire strength at the polls, November 7. An urgent call is being sent to all church members to register October 7, in accordance with the law requiring all voters to register again this year.

Unity Fellowship Associates

Names added to membership since list was printed in UNITY of April 6, 1922:

CALIFORNIA—
Palo Alto: Rev. Elmo A. Robinson.
Stanford University: Karl G. Rendtorff, P. O. Box 1302; Mrs. Emma Rendtorff, P. O. Box 1302.

FLORIDA—
Winter Park: Mr. H. Siewert.

ILLINOIS—
Chicago: Mrs. Annie Laurie Kelly, 700 Oakwood Blvd.; Miss Fanny G. Strauss, 4358 Drexel Blvd.; Mrs. E. L. Lobdell, 2716 Prairie Ave.; Mrs. S. O. Levinson, 4049 Lake Park Ave.; Mrs. E. E. Smith, 5134 Woodlawn Ave.; Mrs. C. E. Nagely, 5758 Kenwood Ave.; Katherine (Mrs. Walter) Hoffman, 114 E. Walton Pl.; Mr. W. W. Kester, 1115 N. Kedvale Ave.
Glencoe: Mrs. Anna K. Hulburd, 333 Hazel Ave.
Glen Ellyn: Mrs. William E. Mason; Mr. Benjamin F. March, Jr.
Ravinia: Brent Dow Allinson. (Permanent address, "Brentwood," Glencoe. Now abroad with Friends Relief Mission.)

IOWA—
Iowa City: Marion O'Harrow, 414 Brown St.

LOUISIANA—
New Orleans: Miss Josephine Riess, 1423 Milan St.

MASSACHUSETTS—
Arlington: Mrs. Arthur H. Lawson, 13 Ravine St.
Boston: Edward A. Talbot, 14 Ellington St.; Mrs. D. C. French, 44 Lyndhurst St.
Brookline: Miss Lydia G. Wentworth, 51 Addington Road.
Cambridge: Norman E. Himes, 66 Winthrop St. (Harvard Students Liberal League); Mr. and Mrs. H. Bosshard, 16 Berkeley St.; Mrs. Bertha S. Papazian, 6 Ellsworth Ave.
Chelsea: Mrs. Maud E. Burke, 31 Franklin St.
Dorchester: Miss Annie M. Jarvis, 15 Woodford St.
East Lynn: Mrs. Eliza J. Hitchcock, 154 Jenness St.
Hudson: Mr. Theodore P. Perkins.
Petersham: Miss Marianna Gay.
Somerville: Mrs. Carrie Armitage, 57 Madison St.
Winchester: Mr. F. Percyval Lewis, P. O. Box 145.

MICHIGAN—
Lake Side: Mrs. Merritt W. Pinckney.

MINNESOTA—
Ada: Mabel Brattland.

MISSOURI—
Columbia: W. C. Curtis, 208 Hicks Ave. (University of Missouri.)

NEBRASKA—
North Platte: Mrs. Mary H. Axtell, 1406 W. Fifth St.

NEW HAMPSHIRE—
Francestown: Rev. Geo. Willis Cooke.

NEW JERSEY—
Summit: Parker D. King.

NEW YORK—
Clayville: Alice M. (Mrs. E. B.) Avery.
New York City: Rev. John Herman Randall, 19 E. 126th St.; Mrs. M. E. Endell, 437 W. 117th St.; Mr. Charles K. Ovington, 64 East 86th St.
Schenectady: Mr. and Mrs. C. H. Prange, 1151 Eastern Ave.

TEXAS—
Dallas: Mr. G. C. Edwards, 2603 Shelby St.

VERMONT—
Rochester: Rev. Charles Chambers Connor; Rev. Mary Andrews Connor.

WASHINGTON:
Seattle: Florence A. Onsum, 806 E. 55th St.; Peter Onsum, 806 E. 55th St.

WEST VIRGINIA—
Elm Grove: Rev. Harry Taylor.

WISCONSIN—
Osceola: C. W. Staples.
Tomahawk: M. Mohr Griffith, Forest Place; Dr. Evelyn Hoehne (Traveling).

ENGLAND—
London: Rev. Frederick Hankinson, Unitarian Church, Kentish Town (60 Haverstock Hill, Hampstead).

REUNION IN AUSTRALIA.

An invitation to write on "Reunion" for *The Constructive Quarterly* (June issue) came to Bishop White, of Willochra, South Australia, while he was on a long journey through the bush. Cut off from libraries or the advice of friends, he says, he nevertheless determined to respond without delay, and to write as an ordinary man of what ordinary men in Australia are thinking on the subject of Reunion. We are accustomed to believe that the rank and file of the Churches, though they may some day come to realize the evils of division, for the present experience little dissatisfaction with sectarian limitations. That this is not the case in Australia is evident from Bishop White's words. "The ordinary man," he says, "is more and more saying to his spiritual pastors and masters, 'We cannot afford to wait indefinitely while you settle your disputes. . . . We are fighting for our spiritual existence, and if the constituted authorities are unequal to the job, then it is the business of every Christian to come forward and do his best for his life, however ignorantly and clumsily he may do it. Anything is better than to drift on with a Church which, because of its divisions, has no influence on the world.' That is what I hear from laymen on every side."—*Literary News Notes* (Geo. H. Doran Company).

A NEW WAY OF TEMPTING READERS.

The question is often asked "What makes a book sell?" No method has yet been discovered to surpass the praise of an enthusiastic reader. A novel plan has been hit upon by a Portland, Oregon, man who wants everybody to read "The Myth of a Guilty Nation" by Albert Jay Nock. He writes to a local newspaper discussing Europe's economic troubles and leads up to this final paragraph:

"There is just out a book treating this matter authentically. It gives as its authority the secret treaties and war standings of the European nations from 1905 to 1914, the breaking out of the world war. It is entitled 'The Myth of a Guilty Nation.' We have a number of copies of this book for distribution. Readers of this book will become lieutenant-thinkers of the new age. Had Germany's army and people the courage to have revolted (shot their officers and gone home, as was suggested by David Starr Jordan) at the beginning of the war as they did revolt at the close, think what would have been saved the world in life and property!

"The readers of this book will be wise to conditions that will prevail when this world revolution comes on. Because I wish to help the world to think, I am offering to loan the books to readers *who will send me one dime* with their address and promise to return or deliver the book to my order to another reader. I prefer to loan it rather than sell it to lie on the shelf, unused."

—*Freeman Notes.*

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Improve Your Appetite
BOWMAN'S MILK is good for grown-ups. It furnishes abundant nourishment without tiring the digestive organs.
BOWMAN DAIRY Company

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

DREXEL State Bank
Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.
Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .
Your savings and checking account cordially invited
Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company
Cleaners of
Fancy Gowns and Kid Gloves
Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth
Phone Drexel 0231
All Departments
MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Subscribe for and read
UNITY

It's a "Case" of Necessity
Your Printing will be above criticism if done by
THE OAKLAND PRESS
728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244